

Remarks

This amendment is responsive to the Office action mailed February 11, 2009. Page and paragraph references are to that Office action unless otherwise indicated.

Changes Made

The cross-reference on page 1 has been amended to delete the attorney docket number of the referenced application and replace it with the serial number, 10/706,374. As amended, the cross-reference also indicates the abandoned status of the '374 application.¹

Claim 13 has been amended to incorporate certain limitations of claim 1, which has been cancelled. Thus, claim 13 as amended is directed to a method for controlling content displayed during a computer-driven presentation on a plurality of logical displays attached to a computer system and controlled by a presentation graphics application running on the computer system. The method is performed by the presentation graphics application and comprises the steps of: (1) associating a user-selectable hidden object presentation property with a selected object within a presentation page, the hidden object presentation property indicating a display attribute for which the selected object is presented during the computer-driven presentation; (2) assigning a user-selectable display attribute to each of the plurality of logical displays, the display attribute indicating hidden object presentation properties of objects within presentation pages to be presented on such logical display during the computer-driven presentation; and (3) presenting, on each of the plurality of logical displays, objects associated with hidden object presentation properties indicated by the display attribute assigned to that logical display while inhibiting presentation of other objects on that logical display.

Claims 2-12, formerly dependent on claim 1, have been amended where appropriate to depend on claim 13 as amended.

¹ The '374 application was abandoned following a rejection of all claims by the Examiner in that case as being anticipated by McCardle et al., U.S. Patent 5,859,974 (McCardle '974). McCardle '974 was cited the specification of this application on page 5, as well as in an information disclosure statement (IDS) filed with the application, but has not been applied against the claims of this application.

Claim 31 has been similarly amended to incorporate certain limitations of claim 19, which has been cancelled. Claims 20-30, formerly dependent on claim 19, have been amended where appropriate to depend on claim 31 as amended.

Claims 15-16 and 33-34 have been amended to correctly use the singular form “criterion”.

Finally, a new claim 37, similar to claim 13 as amended but directed to a system, has been added. Applicants note that the originally filed application referred to the invention as contemplating a “system” as well as a method and computer program product (abstract; page 7, par. 17), so new claim 37 is merely in keeping with that statement.

Claims 13 and 31 as amended and new claim 37 are believed to distinguish patentably over the art of record. In particular, these claims are believed to distinguish patentably over Simonoff et al., U.S. Patent 7,162,528 (“Simonoff”), cited by the Examiner (page 2, par. 4). Simonoff describes a collaborative computing environment (Fig. 2) containing a server computer 100, an object generator 200, and client computers 300a, 300b. As described in the abstract, each client 300 generates message objects (Fig. 5), each of which includes a nested group identifier and an associated privilege level. Server 100 filters these message objects and routes them only to clients that are members of the group having the group identifier and have a privilege at least equal to the associated privilege level.

While Simonoff has some similarities the applicants’ claimed invention, the reference does not anticipate it or render it obvious. Applicants’ invention relates to controlling content displayed during a computer-driven presentation on a plurality of logical displays (160, 170, 180) attached to a computer system (110) and controlled by a presentation graphics application (120) running on the computer system. In Simonoff, on the other hand, the content control is provided by a separate computer system, the server 100, which decides in the first instance whether to send a particular object to a particular client 300. As disclosed, Simonoff’s client 300 functionality does not control multiple logical displays attached to a computer system on which it is running, nor does it inhibit the presentation of objects on an attached display. Similarly, Simonoff’s server

100 functionality does not control multiple logical displays attached to a computer system on which it is running. Rather, each client display is controlled by a separate client computer.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, applicants' claims as currently presented are believed to distinguish patentably over the prior art. Reconsideration of the application as amended and, upon such reconsideration, a favorable action on the merits are therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

IRA L. CHAVIS et al.

By /William A. Kinnaman, Jr./

William A. Kinnaman, Jr., Reg. No. 27,650

Voice: (845) 433-1175

Fax: (845) 432-9601

Email: wak@us.ibm.com

WAK/wak